

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PART OF THE PATENTS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/738,452	12/17/2003	Rolf Gertzmann	PO7899/LeA 36,521	8096
157 7	590 05/09/2005		EXAM	INER
BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC			GORR, RACHEL F	
100 BAYER R PITTSBURGE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/738,452	GERTZMANN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
*	Rachel F. Gorr	1711
The MAILING DATE of this communication a eriod for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of them may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (60) days, a ' If MO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply with of the set or extended period for reply with of the set of extended period for reply with of the set of extended period for reply with of the set of extended period for reply with of the set of extended period for reply with of the set of extended period for reply with of the set of	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, r eply within the statutory minimum od will apply and will expire SIX (6	nay a reply be timely filed  of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  ) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08	<u> April 2005</u> .	
2a)☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☑ T	his action is non-final.	
Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal	matters, prosecution as to the ments is
closed in accordance with the practice under	er Ex parte Quayle, 193	5 C.D. 11,453 C.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		9-7-7-8
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application	ion.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideratio	n.
5) Claim(s) 2,6-9 and 11 is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1.3 and 10 is/are rejected.		
7) ☐ Claim(s) 4 and 5 is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requireme	nt.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
10\□ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□	accepted or b) object	ed to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Poplecoment drawing sheet(s) including the col	rrection is required if the d	rawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(0).
. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the at	tached Office Action or form P10-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		
<ul><li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents.</li><li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents.</li></ul>	nents have been receive	ed in Application No.
Certified copies of the priority docum     Copies of the certified copies of the	priority documents have	been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bu	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copi	es not received.
Good trip ditability document 5.1.30 delien is 1		-
Attachment(s)	, n:	Landing Commons (PTO 413)
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	, P	terview Summary (PTO-413) aper No(s)/Mail Date
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-944     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ο,	otice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/738,452

Art Unit: 1711

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly

owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3 and 10 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 and 4 of copending Application No. 10/738,504. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to polyurethane prepolymer blocked with the same blocking agent. The copending claims require the presence of both hydrophilic polyethers and ionic hydrophilic groups, whereas the claims of this application specify ionic and/or hydrophilic non-ionic, which would be a polyether. Both sets of claims are directed to coatings made with the prepolymer. It would have been obvious to include both ionic and polyether in the present application because it would be a choice of one of only three possible choices.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,452

Art Unit: 1711

Claims 1 and 3 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of copending Application No. 10/738,742. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to prepolymers blocked with the same blocking agent. The copending claims specify ether units in the prepolymer and the present claims specify either ionic hydrophilic and/or nonionic hydrophilic (presumably ether) components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose the nonionic hydrophilic ether complonents because it would be obvious to choose two of only three possible choices.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel F. Gorr whose telephone number is 571-272-1072. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Tues., Thurs., Fri., from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/738,452

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R.G. May 2, 2005

> RACHEL GORR PRIMARY EXAMINES